	Cascase04:04-09-18811-811-1111JJD & Cascase04:04-09-18811-811-1111JJD & Cascase04:04-09-18811-811-1111JJD & Cascase04:04-09-18811-811-1111JJD & Cascase04:04-09-18811-811-1111JJD & Cascase04:04-09-18811-811-111JJD & Cascase04:04-09-18811-811-111-111-111-111-111-111-111-	95 FFileed 1006/1155/2000 6 Pag Reagter of 3 of 3
1	SUSAN MUCK (CSB No. 126930) smuck@fenwick.com	
2	JENNIFER C. BRETAN (CSB No. 233475) jbretan@fenwick.com	
3	FENWICK & WEST LLP 275 Battery Street, Suite 1500	
4	San Francisco, California 94111 Telephone: (415) 875-2300 Facsimile: (415) 281-1350	
5		
6	EMMETT C. STANTON (CSB No. 83930) estanton@fenwick.com	
7	FENWICK & WEST LLP Silicon Valley Center 801 California Street Mountain View, CA 94041 Telephone: (650) 988-8500 Facsimile: (650) 938-5200	
8		
9		
10		
11	Attorneys for Defendants INVISION TECHNOLOGIES, INC., SERGIO MAGISTRI and ROSS MULHOLLAND	
12		
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
14	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
15	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
16	IN RE INVISION TECHNOLOGIES, INC. SECURITIES LITIGATION	Case No. C-04-3181 (MJJ)
17		STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING BRIEFING AND HEARING
18		SCHEDULE FOR DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS SECOND AMENDED
19		CONSOLIDATED COMPLAINT
20		The Honorable Martin J. Jenkins
21	This Stipulation is entered into by and among lead Plaintiffs, Glazer Capital Management,	
22	LP and Glazer Offshore Fund, Ltd. ("Plaintiffs") and Defendants InVision Technologies, Inc.	
23	("InVision"), Sergio Magistri and Ross Mulholland (collectively, "Defendants"), by and through	
24	their respective attorneys of record, as follows:	
25	WHEREAS, Plaintiffs filed a Second Amended Consolidated Complaint on February 22,	
26	2006;	
27	WHEREAS, the parties previously agreed to briefing and hearing schedules for	
28	Defendants' Motion to Dismiss in this matter, which were approved by this Court on March 16,	
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING BRIE CASE NO. C-04-3181 (MJJ)	FING AND HEARING SCHEDULE

1 2006 and April 26, 2006, respectively; 2 WHEREAS unexpected client demands and a number of scheduling conflicts have arisen 3 on short notice including, among other things, responding to a threatened preliminary injunction 4 and court ordered expedited discovery on another matter and a direct time conflict resulting from 5 coverage for a departing colleague, Defendants' counsel requested that Plaintiffs' counsel agree 6 to a revised briefing and hearing schedule, and an agreement was reached as to a revised 7 schedule, subject to the Court's next available hearing date, which Defendants are informed by 8 the Courtroom Deputy is July 25, 2006; 9 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED, pursuant to Northern District of California Local Rule 10 6-1(b), 6-2, and 7-12 that: 11 Defendants' reply in support of their motion to dismiss shall be filed on or before (1) 12 June 27, 2006; and 13 (4) The hearing on Defendants' motion to dismiss shall be on July 25, 2006, at 14 9:30am, or such other date and time as the Court may find convenient. 15 Dated: June 15, 2006 FENWICK & WEST LLP 16 17 Susan S. Muck 18 Attorneys for Defendants INVISION TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; SERGIO 19 MAGISTRI and ROSS MULHOLLAND 20 Dated: June 15, 2006 ABRAHAM, FRUCHTER & TWERSKY, LLP 21 22 s/Lawrence D. Levit By: Lawrence D. Levit 23 Lead Counsel for the Plaintiffs 24 25 26 27 28

1	<u>ORDER</u>	
2		
3	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.	
4		
5	Dated: _6/15/2006, 2006	
6	The Honorable Martin J. Jenkins United States District Judge	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	23570/00404/SF/5171780	
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING BRIEFING AND HEARING SCHEDULE	